



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Coln  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,238	05/25/2001	Nadeem Ahmed	1789-04801	3979
23505	7590	09/20/2005	EXAMINER	
CONLEY ROSE, P.C. P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			WARE, CICELY Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2634	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/865,238	AHMED ET AL.	
	Examiner Cicely Ware	Art Unit 2634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13 and 15-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 10 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 6/22/2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the **REMARKS** Pgs. 4-5, applicant recites, "Independent claim 1 recites "a detection module configured to determine a channel symbol from the [frequency component] amplitudes while accounting for correlation between the amplitudes. Independent claim 19 recites a similar limitation". Examiner asserts Kumar in col. 1, lines 50-58 discloses "wherein the transmission medium affects the signal by altering the amplitude and/or phase of the frequency components, which together make up the signal", also col. 2, lines 10-12, col. 7, lines 4-18, Kumar discloses wherein "multi-path is a frequency-selective phenomenon; the deleterious effects vary with frequency". Kumar further discloses wherein the spreading effect is collapsed in the receiver by the process of correlation, in which since the multipath is frequency-selective, only part of the spread signal is perturbed", col. 2, lines 13-24. Therefore the original rejection to claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-23 still stands

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 16, 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Kumar (US Patent 5,748,677).

(1) With regard to claim 1, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art discloses in (Fig. 2) a communications receiver that comprises: an analog-to-digital converter (26) that samples a DMT (discrete multi-tone) signal to obtain a digital receive signal; a transform module (34) coupled to the analog-to-digital converter and configured to determine amplitudes associated with frequency components of the digital receive signal (Pg. 2, lines 1-8, Pg. 5, lines 19-24).

However Applicant's Admitted Prior Art does not disclose a detection module configured to determine a channel symbol from the amplitudes while accounting for correlation between the amplitudes.

However Kumar discloses a detection module configured to determine a channel symbol from the amplitudes while accounting for correlation between the amplitudes (col. 1, lines 50-58, col. 2, lines 1-8, 13-24, 32-40, 60-62, 65-67, col. 3, lines 1-4, col. 6, lines 8-10, col. 11, lines 32-52).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Kumar to incorporate a detection module configured to determine a channel symbol from the amplitudes while accounting for correlation between the amplitudes in order to increase the SNR of the determined reference signal in the receiver so that the reference signal may be transmitted at a lower power, reduce the effect of stationary interference and offsets on the

determination of the transmitted reference signal in the receiver and reduce the effect of system nonlinearity of the determination of the transmitted reference signal in the receiver (Kumar, col. 14, lines 30-36).

(2) With regard to claim 2, claim 2 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Kumar further discloses wherein the detection module determines the most probable channel symbol given the amplitudes determined by the transform module (col. 10, lines 60-67, col. 11, lines 32-52).

(3) With regard to claim 3, claim 3 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Kumar further discloses a weighted sum unit associated with each frequency component, wherein each weighted sum unit combines a plurality of amplitudes from the transform module in a manner designed to minimize any error between the output of the weighted sum unit and a valid output value (col. 7, lines 4-18, col. 9, lines 1-6, col. 10, lines 23-28, 63-67, col. 11, lines 1-5, 32-52).

(4) With regard to claim 4, claim 4 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Kumar further discloses the detection module determines the channel symbol that corresponds to a matrix product of a matrix M and a vector of amplitudes from the transform module, wherein the matrix M minimizes a square of an expected error between the channel symbol and valid channel symbols (col. 10, lines 23-28, 63-67, col. 11, lines 1-5, 32-52).

(5) With regard to claim 6, claim 6 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Kumar further discloses in a time domain equalizer that operates on the digital receive signal to maximize a percentage of impulse response energy in a predetermined interval in order

to cause an effective increase in the SNR of the reference signal estimate at the receiver (col. 19, lines 36-67, col. 23, lines 29-36, col. 26, lines 9-12).

(6) With regard to claim 8, claim 8 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Kumar further discloses in an error correction code decoder that decodes channel symbols received from the detection module in order to make the bit error rate of the decoded bit sequence substantially lower than that of the estimated bit sequence (col. 11, lines 15-25).

(7) With regard to claim 9, claim 9 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Applicant's Admitted Prior Art further discloses in (Fig. 2) the transform module performs a fast Fourier Transform (FFT) (34) on the receive signal in each channel symbol interval (Pg. 6, lines 20-21, Pg. 11, lines 2-11).

(8) With regard to claim 11, claim 11 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Applicant's Admitted Prior Art further discloses a method of receiving OFDM modulated data (Pg. 5, lines 19-25).

(9) With regard to claim 12, claim 12 inherits all the limitations of claims 11 and 2.

(10) With regard to claim 13, claim 13 inherits all the limitations of claims 11 and 3.

(11) With regard to claim 16, claim 16 inherits all the limitations of claim 11. Applicant's Admitted Prior Art further discloses in (Fig. 2) processing the receive signal to shorten (26) the effective channel impulse response before performing said determining a set of frequency component amplitudes (34).

(12) With regard to claim 18, claim 18 inherits all the limitations of claim 11.

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art further discloses in (Fig. 2) determining a set of frequency component amplitudes includes: converting the receive signal into digital form (26); and performing a fast Fourier Transform on the digital receive signal (34).

(13) With regard to claim 19, claim 19 inherits all the limitations of claim 1. Kumar further discloses in a transmitter that transmits an OFDM modulated signal; and a receiver that receives and demodulates a corrupted version of the OFDM modulated signal (col. 11, lines 32-52).

(14) With regard to claim 20, claim 20 inherits all the limitations of claims 19 and 2.

(15) With regard to claim 21, claim 21 inherits all the limitations of claims 19 and 3.

(16) With regard to claim 22, claim 22 inherits all the limitations of claims 19 and 4.

4. Claims 5 and 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (design choice (OFDM system)) as applied to claims 1 and 11 and 19, in view of Kumar (US Patent 5,748,677)

(1) With regard to claim 5, claim 5 inherits all the limitations of claim 1 above. An OFDM system inherently possess a subtraction module that removes trailing intersymbol interference from the output of the transform module to obtain ISI-corrected frequency component values (Pg. 2, lines 15-23).

Art Unit: 2634

However Applicant's design choice does not disclose a decision unit that determines a matrix product of a matrix M and a vector of ISI-corrected frequency component values to obtain the channel symbol; and a feedback module that determines a matrix product of a matrix T and the channel symbol from the decision unit to provide the trailing intersymbol interference to the subtraction module.

However Kumar discloses a decision unit in that determines a matrix product of a matrix M and a vector of ISI-corrected frequency component values to obtain the channel symbol; and a feedback module that determines a matrix product of a matrix T and the channel symbol from the decision unit to provide the trailing intersymbol interference to the subtraction module (col. 10, col. 31-43, col. 11, lines 32-52)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Kumar to incorporate a decision unit that determines a matrix product of a matrix M and a vector of ISI-corrected frequency component values to obtain the channel symbol; and a feedback module that determines a matrix product of a matrix T and the channel symbol from the decision unit to provide the trailing intersymbol interference to the subtraction module to increase the SNR of the determined reference signal in the receiver so that the reference signal may be transmitted at a lower power, reduce the effect of stationary interference and offsets on the determination of the transmitted reference signal in the receiver and reduce the effect of system nonlinearity of the determination of the transmitted reference signal in the receiver (Kumar, col. 14, lines 30-36).

(2) With regard to claim 15, claim 15 inherits all the limitations of claims 11 and 5.

(3) With regard to claim 23, claim 23 inherits all the limitations of claims 19 and 5.

5. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (design choice (OFDM system)) as applied to claims 1 and 11, in view of Kumar (US Patent 5,748,677) in further view of Raleigh et al. (US Patent 6,452,981).

(1) With regard to claim 7, claim 7 inherits all the limitations of claim 1.

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Kumar disclose all the limitations of claim 1.

However Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Kumar do not disclose a cyclic prefix remover that removes prefixes from the digital receive signal, each prefix being associated with a respective channel symbol.

However Raleigh et al. discloses a cyclic prefix remover that removes prefixes from the digital receive signal, each prefix being associated with a respective channel symbol (col. 14, lines 46-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Kumar in further view of Raleigh et al. to incorporate a cyclic prefix remover that removes prefixes from the digital receive signal, each prefix being associated with a respective channel symbol in order to substantially remove the ISI between any two symbols assigned to different bins, for any pair of transmit and receive antennas (Raleigh et al., col. 14, lines 54-56).

(2) With regard to claim 17, claim 17 inherits all the limitations of claims 11 and 7.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 10 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The instant application discloses a communications receiver. Prior art references show similar methods but fail to teach: **“wherein the transform module includes a bank of matched bandpass filters”**, as in claim 10; **“determining a channel symbol includes: determining a product of a matrix M and the set of frequency component amplitudes, wherein the matrix M includes at least two non-zero values in each row”**, as in claim 14.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cicely Ware whose telephone number is 703-305-8326. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 703-305-4714. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*Cicely Ware*

cqw  
September 14, 2005



STEPHEN CHIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEE  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600